

179.5/
Am3

The American
Anti-Vivisection Society.

FORMERLY THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE RESTRICTION OF VIVISECTION.

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT.

OFFICE, No. 1701 CHESTNUT STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.
1891.

THE AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY,

For the total abolition of all vivisectional experiments on
animals and other experiments of a painful character.

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
AMERICAN
ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY,
FOR THE
YEAR ENDING JANUARY 30th, 1891.

Organized February 23d, 1883.

Incorporated May, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:
1701 CHESTNUT STREET.
1891.

BOARD OF MANAGERS

OF THE

AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT.

MATTHEW WOODS, M.D.,
1307 South Broad Street.

VICE-PRESIDENTS IN PENNSYLVANIA.

<p>HIRAM CORSON, M.D., Conshohocken, Montgomery Co.</p> <p>GEORGE F. HORTON, M.D., Terrytown, Bradford Co.</p> <p>JOHN A. BROOKE, M.D., Reading, Berks Co.</p> <p>A. D. JOHNSON, M.D., Allegheny City.</p>	<p>S. A. S. JESSUP, M.D., Kittanning, Armstrong Co.</p> <p>CHARLES T. PALMER, M.D., Pottsville, Schuylkill Co.</p> <p>W. S. FOSTER, M.D., Pittsburgh.</p> <p>ISAAC MASSEY, M.D., West Chester, Chester Co.</p>
--	--

VICE-PRESIDENTS IN PHILADELPHIA.

<p>WM. R. D. BLACKWOOD, M.D., 246 North Twentieth Street.</p> <p>MR. HENRY FLANDERS, 419 Walnut Street.</p> <p>MR. SAMUEL HINDS THOMAS, 2113 Pine Street.</p> <p>MRS. WAYNE MACVEAGH, 1817 Walnut Street.</p> <p>PROFESSOR J. RENDAL HARRIS, Haverford College, Pa.</p>	<p>MRS. GEORGE S. LOVELL, Erya Mawr, Penna.</p> <p>MR. ALGERNON SIDNEY LOGAN, 247 South Eighteenth Street.</p> <p>MR. BENJAMIN B. COMEGYS, 4205 Walnut Street.</p> <p>JAMES E. GARRETSON, M.D., 1537 Chestnut Street.</p> <p>REV. J. ANDREWS HARRIS, D.D., Chestnut Hill.</p>
--	--

SECRETARY.

MISS ADELE BIDDLE,
2033 Pine Street.

TREASURER.

MR. STEPHEN FARRELLY,
Central News Company.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

MRS. RICHARD P. WHITE,
2024 Chestnut Street.

COUNSELLORS.

MR. RICHARD P. WHITE. **MR. CHARLES BIDDLE.**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

<p>MISS S. L. BALDWIN, 1318 Spruce Street.</p> <p>MISS MARTHA MILLIGAN, 1500 Pine Street.</p> <p>MRS. ROBERT W. SMITH, Rosemont, Montgomery Co., Pa.</p> <p>MR. ROBERT W. RYERSS, 922 Walnut Street.</p> <p>MRS. JOHN EASBY, 311 South Sixteenth Street.</p> <p>MISS S. K. DAVIDSON, 3320 Arch Street.</p> <p>MR. GEO. H. EARLE, Drexel Building.</p> <p>MISS CAROLINE BOGGS, 304 South Nineteenth Street.</p> <p>MRS. J. C. RANDALL, 1905 Chestnut Street.</p> <p>MR. THOMAS EARLE WHITE, Drexel Building.</p>	<p>MR. JOEL J. BAILY, 1826 Arch Street.</p> <p>MRS. TRAVIS COCHRAN, 131 South Twenty-second Street.</p> <p>MRS. CHARLES J. BIDDLE, 2033 Pine Street.</p> <p>MRS. J. RENDAL HARRIS, Haverford College, Penna.</p> <p>MRS. JAMES MARTIN, 1716 Locust Street.</p> <p>MISS ANNIE C. KNIGHT, 1605 Chestnut Street.</p> <p>MISS FRANCES FERGUSON, 1314 Walnut Street.</p> <p>MRS. A. SIDNEY LOGAN, 247 South Eighteenth Street.</p> <p>MISS MARGARET S. BEDELI, 1338 Pine Street.</p> <p>MR. EDWARD B. MEARS, 2222 Pine Street.</p>
---	---

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY.

MADE ON JANUARY 30TH, 1891.

We have the honor to make the following report for the year just passed—1890.

We have no signal victory to report for our cause, such as the passing of laws against vivisection by any State legislature, nor the formation of other Societies similar to our own, in other States or cities; but we see that awakening of public sentiment, in favor of our cause, that must precede the passing of laws, if they are to be effective for the object sought; and in many cities and States fellow-laborers have risen up to work against vivisection, not only in their own neighborhoods but everywhere that their efforts can reach. The literature of the subject has had great additions made to it, and these have been sown over many fields.

One of these acquisitions is a forcible argument against vivisection, based entirely on Christian morality, by Mrs. J. Rendall Harris, of the Society of Friends, and is called "An Appeal to Christians on the Subject of Vivisection." These paragraphs show its tone and force:—

"In almost every age there are questions touching human conduct on which the Church of Christ is called to pronounce its opinion, and to take a stand in opposition to the world and the spirit of the world.

"Vivisection has secretly existed in the world before—

“hidden and ashamed—but never as now uprearing its crest
 “and flaunting its audacity before all eyes; nor has it ever
 “before, so far as we can discover, claimed the sanction of
 “the Church of Christ for its existence. Its plea would not
 “be listened to for a moment by humane, still less by Chris-
 “tian people, were it not that it makes a strong appeal to
 “that self-love which is so strongly rooted in human nature
 “and from which the Church itself is not as yet delivered.”

This able presentation of the subject will help to hasten the day when Christians will oppose the cruelties of vivisection as they now oppose every other form of cruelty. Another contribution to the literature of the subject that we have acquired this year, is a reprint of the English pamphlet, “Vivisection in America” which Mr. Philip G. Peabody, of Boston, has issued, with letters from persons of note written after receiving a gift of the pamphlet. One of these letters we are glad to present in this Report, as the words of one of the representative men of the Protestant Episcopal church, Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., of Trinity Church, New York. It is as follows:—

NEW YORK, April 12th, 1890.

Philip G. Peabody, Esq.,

“My Dear Sir.—I acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 2^o ult., together with a copy of your pamphlet “entitled ‘Vivisection in America.’ You request me to read that pamphlet. I respectfully decline to do so, as the subject is too horrible for consideration.

“I have read accounts of the tortures inflicted in the name “of science on the creatures committed to our care or placed “in our power by a Divine Providence, and they have made “me sick at heart for weeks together. I shall never peruse “these frightful statistics again. I have also read what “arguments are made in extenuation or recommendation of “the practice, and their only effect has been to strengthen my “conviction that man is capable of becoming the most barbarous and most merciless of all agents.

"I gladly join with any one who protests against the abuse of our power over confiding and intelligent animals. The lower creation is a deep mystery. There are in it intelligent and sensitive beings with virtues which man may well imitate, and with qualities which inspire affection. God has given us dominion over them and powers which we ought not to abuse; and when I go into His presence I wish to be able to tell Him that I abhor, detest, and protest against the torture of these poor creatures under the pretense of thereby benefiting our own lordly race. You may make what use you please of this letter. I remain, in conclusion,

Respectfully yours,

MORGAN DIX."

We must speak of another letter, the very opposite of this, written by a clergyman of East Newark, of the same Church; for as it has been extensively circulated in a daily paper of this city (The "Press," Jan'y 15th, 1891), it may have produced an impression here, that we desire to efface. The letter was written originally, in answer to a request made to him that, as a clergyman, he would help the anti-vivisection cause. In replying he makes this extraordinary statement

"I have attended courses of instruction in medicine and never saw anything cruel done in vivisection. There is more intense agony and suffering to human beings in any single town in Pennsylvania or this State, caused by worthless cats and curs, than are experienced by the 'dear dumb animals' used in vivisection in all the institutions of Philadelphia or New York. I shall not peruse all that is contained in the pamphlets, because what little I have read I believe to be untrue and grossly misstated, and with a zeal not tempered with wisdom, but something else," etc., etc.

In refutation of this opinion we quote the words of Dr. Albert Leffingwell, of New York and of Dr. Henry J. Bigelow, of Harvard College, who certainly have had more experience than one who has merely "attended courses of instruction in medicine:"—

“‘I think,’ says Dr. Leffingwell, ‘it may safely be asserted that, in the city of New York, in a single medical school, more pain is inflicted upon living animals as a means of teaching well-known facts, than is permitted to be done for the same purpose in all the medical schools of Great Britain and Ireland.’”

Again, “‘We have found this result (loss of voice) to follow in the cat after the spinal accessory nerves have been torn out by the roots,’ says Professor John C. Dalton, in his treatise on Human Physiology. ‘This operation is difficult,’ writes Professor Flint, ‘but we have several times performed it with entire success;’ and his assistant at Bellevue Medical College has succeeded ‘in extirpating these nerves for class demonstrations.’ In withdrawal of blood from the hepatic veins of a dog, ‘avoiding the administration of an anæsthetic’ is one of the steps recommended.

“Not long ago in a certain medical college in the State of New York, I saw what Doctor Sharpey, for thirty years the professor of physiology in the University Medical College, London, once characterized by antithesis as ‘Magen-die’s infamous experiment,’ it having been first performed by that eminent physiologist. Doctor Sharpey, a strong advocate of vivisection, by the way, condemned it as a perfectly unjustifiable experiment, since ‘besides its atrocity, it was really purposeless.’

“There is a certain experiment—one of the most excruciating that can be performed—which consists in exposing the spinal cord of the dog for the purpose of demonstrating the functions of the spinal nerves. This experiment—which we are told passes even the callousness of Germany to repeat; which every leading champion of vivisection in Great Britain reprobates for medical teaching; which some of them shrink even from seeing, themselves, from horror at the torture necessarily inflicted; which the most ruthless among them *dare not* exhibit to the young men of England—*this experiment has been performed publicly again and*

“again in American medical colleges, without exciting, so far as we know, even a whisper of protest or the faintest murmur of remonstrance! The proof is to be found in the published statements of the experimenter himself. In his “Text-Book of Physiology,” Professor Flint says, ‘Magen-
 “die showed very satisfactorily that the posterior roots (of the spinal cord) were exclusively sensory, and this fact has been confirmed by more recent observations upon the higher classes of animals. We have ourselves frequently exposed and irritated the roots in the nerves in dogs in public demonstrations, in experiments on the recurrent sensibility . . . and in another series of observations.’

“This is the experience of a single professional teacher, but it is improbable that this experiment has been shown only to the students of a single medical college in the United States; it has doubtless been repeated again and again in different colleges throughout the country.” (Essays on Vivisection, pages 23, 44, 48, 68.)

Dr. Henry J. Bigelow, of Harvard College, has also said, “It is dreadful to think how many poor animals will be subjected to excruciating agony, as one medical college after another becomes penetrated with the idea that vivisection is a part of modern teaching, and that to hold way with other institutions they must have their Vivisector, their mutilated dogs, their guinea pigs, their rabbits, their chamber of torture and of horrors, to advertise as a laboratory.”

Experimenters have furnished us again this year with good reasons for prosecuting our work with double ardor, appealing to all who have the least sympathy for the sufferings of animals to take some part in our task of rescuing them from the refined and ingenious cruelties practiced by some investigators. Upheld by their profession, and not as yet fearing the public indignation that ought to be aroused by the details of their cruelties, they frankly narrate them, and the

public, as well as the medical world can read just what they have done.

It is an unwelcome task to speak of such cruelties; but as long as our opponents deny that we have any cause as a society to exist, we must contradict their position by facts. One set of experiments has been brought to our notice by a criticism of them in the *British Medical Journal* of last November. Before quoting the opinion of them expressed by the *British* editor, we will recall a fact which many of us remember.

In May, 1886, the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Jersey City caused the arrest of a physician, Dr. B. A. Watson, who was engaged in experimenting on dogs by dropping them from a height, so that the spinal injuries they suffered could be watched and recorded. The newspapers of that date contained accounts of the prosecution and the exact nature of the experiments, and shortly after, they mentioned, that at the meeting of the New Jersey Medical Society, when Dr. Watson was present, resolutions were adopted "strongly favoring vivisection in scientific pursuits." If this encouragement induced a renewal of the experiments, the Medical Society cannot be congratulated on the result. The *British Medical Journal* of Nov. 15, 1890, under "Reviews and Notices" criticises most unfavorably Dr. B. A. Watson's recently published volume. This criticism is certainly not because of the Journal's objections to experiments in general upon living animals, as it opens its Review by commending them, as follows:—

"American surgeons have done much good original work
 "in which they have availed themselves of the opportunity
 "they possess of prosecuting their observations by judicious
 "experiments on animals, . . . and the advance made in the
 "treatment of many forms of human injury is recognizable as
 "due to the results obtained by carefully planned experiments
 "on the living animal; but there should be no possibility
 "of the charge of wanton cruelty against the operator. The

“present pamphlet, however, calls for our strongest reprobation,
 “as a record of the most wanton and stupidest cruelty we have
 “ever seen chronicled under the guise of scientific experiments.
 “If this were a type of experimental inquiry indulged in by
 “the profession, public feeling would rightly be against us;
 “for, apart from the utterly useless nature of the observations
 “as far as regards human surgery or pathology, there is a
 “callous indifference shown in the description of the sufferings
 “of the poor brutes, which is *positively* revolting. He was
 “not satisfied with a few of these cruel mockeries of scientific
 “research, but *indulged* in 141.

“We presume that man is essentially the subject, and the
 “injuries received by him in railway accidents the matter to
 “be elucidated. How far the dog’s spine resembles or differs
 “mechanically from man’s is not worth the author’s con-
 “sideration; and how far the dropping a dog down from a
 “height represents the kind of injury to which human beings
 “are liable in railway concussions or smashes, we leave to
 “our readers to judge; however, the dogs were ‘hopped,’ what-
 “ever that may mean. The dog was not killed and examined
 “immediately, unless the drop fortunately saved him from a
 “lingering existence.

“We can hardly wonder that the author was exposed to
 “‘considerable annoyance’ at one time. We think he would
 “have been exposed to more in most countries. What con-
 “clusions can be drawn from these unscientific experiments?
 “That dogs falling from a height of twenty-four feet were
 “liable to rupture or injure lungs, liver, kidneys, viscera,
 “blood vessels, or bones? Is there anything new or useful
 “in this grand discovery? That pathological changes rarely
 “occurred in the spinal cord? Does this help us to any
 “similar conclusion after totally dissimilar railway accidents
 “to man? Not the least. He thinks that in many cases
 “vertebral ligaments were stretched and that such may be
 “easily overlooked ‘in the living subject’ and on post-
 “mortem examination. What assistance does he give in diag-

NOTE.—The italics above are there through a mistake, they are not in the original.

"nosing these? None whatever. We trust no one in our profession or out of it, will be tempted by the fancy that these or such like experiments are scientific or profitable. Badly planned and without a chance of teaching us anything, and carried out in a wholesale cruel way, we cannot but feel ashamed of the work as undertaken by a member of our profession."

A recent experiment in New York, at the Charity Hospital, carried on by Dr. A. M. Phelps, and known as that of the Boy and Dog, has lately attracted attention to other experiments of Dr. Phelps, which he has described in a published account.

We are familiar with details of cruel experiments, but few of them make the experimenter seem more pitiless than these, where a living dog was kept fixed in a cramped position for six weeks, another for three and one-half months, and two dogs for five months, lacking one week, with a plaster-of-Paris bandage, making a stiff collar, "which kept their heads always to the front."

At first they do not strike one as so horrible as some described by Dr. Leffingwell, but the length of time the experiments needed for their completion, constituted their extreme, their inexcusable cruelty.

Describing these operations, Dr. Phelps says:—

"The difficulty of keeping limbs of animals lashed in one position for a long period, together with the possibilities of disease and excoriations, will, I think, be apparent to all. . . . They do not bear confinement well in a cramped, unnatural position. However, with all these difficulties to overcome, we succeeded in keeping one dog six weeks, one dog three and one-half months, and two for five months, lacking one week.

"The first dog, killed at the end of six weeks, was less than one year old. He had been dressed in the following manner: Under ether, the hind leg was carefully dressed with cotton batting. Over this was applied a roller and a plaster-of-Paris bandage, the leg being held in a straight position until the plaster became hard. The body of the dog was now similarly dressed with the cotton batting and roller. A few turns of the plaster-of-Paris around the body, finally including the

“leg, which was drawn well up over the back of the dog, completed the work of immobilizing. This secured the hind leg to the plaster cast, which was closely fitted to the body, making dog, cast, and leg one piece, as it were.

“The leg being drawn up over the back in this intentionally cramped position, induced considerable intra-articular pressure at the hip joint by putting the muscles and ligaments upon the stretch, the leg being used as a lever.

“The dog did very well for a few weeks, there being but slight rise of temperature. But at the end of the fifth week he refused to eat and began to emaciate. A week later, on the forty-second day, he was killed. An excoriation, due to pressure, was found below the knee upon removing the dressings. This accounted for the loss of appetite, as much pain must have been induced. . . .

“The other three dogs were treated similarly to the first, only the fore leg was substituted for the hind leg. The fore leg is easily secured to the body immovably with plaster-of-Paris. To prevent the dogs from gnawing the dressings away, which they would surely do if allowed, the plaster-of-Paris bandage was carried forward on to the neck, making a stiff collar, which kept the heads always to the front. This precaution will be found useful in other kinds of experiments, to prevent dogs from using their teeth upon dressing or apparatus.”

“Dog No. 2 was killed at the end of three and one-half months. . . . Dogs Nos. 3 and 4 developed mange, and were killed at the end of the fifth month, lacking one week (145 days).”

These experiments with the dogs, says the New York Times, show Dr. Phelps' willingness to engage in such work where there are no good reasons for it. As such it becomes vivisection of that nature which is only a little better than the satisfying of idle curiosity. In the last twenty years there has been growing, not only in this country but in Europe, a belief that the results gained from vivisection are in no way commensurate with the horrible tortures inflicted upon helpless animals.

Notwithstanding occasional discouragements there are signs that greater efforts will be made this year by the Christian Church in this cause than have been made before. Last year it was a startling circumstance, when Christian England introduced vivisection to the non-Christian races of India. Then, truly, was Christianity “wounded in the house of its friends.” Lists of experiments on “Pariah” dogs appear hardly credible, so far removed has the east seemed to be, until now, from the scientific cruelties of the west.

We have done a great deal of work, as usual, through pub-

lications. We have printed and distributed five thousand copies of "Vivisection in America." The gift of Dr. Leffingwell, of an edition of his two essays, enabled us to place his arguments against vivisection in the hands of the hundreds of medical students of the University of Penna, the Jefferson College, and the Medico-Chirurgical College, as well as to distribute it widely among physicians of Philadelphia. These essays can be had, gratis, at our office.

In November last Mrs. Mary S. Lovell, of Bryn Mawr, addressed a letter to all the clergy of the Prot. Episcopal Church in the United States, numbering 3800, appealing to them to use their influence against Vivisection. In this letter their attention was called to the fact that in England a Church Anti-Vivisection League had been formed by those who were convinced that a wrong was being done which they as Christ's followers could not ignore.

Among the many favorable answers received by Mrs. Lovell, we have chosen a few for this Report which speak with cordial approval of her work, and of a wish to further it.

The lectures of Mr. U. F. Smiley, of Princeton College, in churches or lecture rooms of churches, have been continued. We will append the list of parishes in which they have been given.

IN 1889.

Scots Presb'y Church, Broad St. and Castle Ave.	Centennial Baptist Church, 23d and Oxford Sts.
Greenwich Presb'y Church, 3d and Greenwich Sts.	St. Luke's Lutheran Church, 7th St. and Montgomery Ave.
Wharton St. Presb'y Church, 9th and Wharton Sts.	Scott Meth. Epis. Church, 8th and Dickinson Sts.
Westminster Presb'y Church, Broad and Fitzwater Sts.	Ebenezer Meth. Epis. Church, 4th and Christian Sts.
Fourth Presb'y Church, 12th and Lombard Sts.	Salem Meth. Epis. Church, Broad and Lombard Sts.
Ninth Presb'y Church, 16th and Sansom Sts.	Thirteenth St. Meth. Epis. Church, 13th and Vine Sts.
Southwestern Presb'y Church, 20th and Fitzwater Sts.	Fifth St. Meth. Epis. Church, 5th and Green Sts.
Spruce St. Baptist Church, 5th and Spruce Sts.	Nineteenth St. Meth. Epis. Church, 19th and Poplar Sts.
Olivet Baptist Church, 6th and Federal Sts.	Greenway Church, 55th St. and Woodland Ave.
Eleventh St. Meth. Epis. Church, 11th St. and Washington Ave.	Cambria Meth. Epis. Church, Cambria St., East of Kensington Ave.

IN 1890.

St. Luke's Meth. Epis. Church, Broad and Jackson Sts.	Oak St. Meth. Epis. Church, Norristown, Pa.
Fourth United Presb'y Church, 19th and Fitzwater Sts.	Bridgeport Presb'y Church, Bridgeport, Pa.
Eighth United Presb'y Church, 15th and Christian Sts.	Second Baptist Church, Norristown, Pa.
Cheltenham Meth. Epis. Church, Cheltenham, Pa.	Centennial Presb'y Church, Jeffersonville, Pa.
Hope Presb'y Church, 33d and Wharton Sts.	Mt. Airy Presb'y Church, Mt. Airy, Pa.
Columbia Ave. Meth. Epis. Church, 25th St. and Columbia Ave.	Church of Mediator, 19th and Lombard Sts.
South Chester Meth. Epis. Church, Chester, Pa.	Harper Memorial Presb'y Church, 29th St. and Susquehanna Ave.
	Beacon Presb'y Church, Cumberland and Cedar Sts.

Two prosecutions for vivisection were brought against physicians in this city during the year. As there is no special law against Vivisection, but only the laws of the State, which forbid every form of cruelty, the prosecutions were made by the Woman's Branch of the Soc'y for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Its annual report will speak of them.

May we be given this year, the knowledge and the zeal we need to continue our work, so as to bring it to ultimate success. Let us, taking the words of the ancient collect, cry to God, Raise up, we pray thee, O Lord, thy power, and come among us, and with great might succour—the helpless creatures that thy hands have made.

Respectfully submitted by

ADELE BIDDLE,

Secretary.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

In the month of April last it was thought well to make an effort to interest the Society of Friends in the Anti-vivisection movement, the same effort having already been contemplated in the Episcopal Church.

Your Corresponding Secretary, therefore, prepared an appeal to the Friends, modeled upon that which Miss Cobbe had addressed to the same Society in Great Britain. It was at that time rather too late to send it in to the yearly meeting of Orthodox Friends, which takes place in April, but it was forwarded by the Corresponding Secretary to the Clerk of both the men's and the women's meetings of the other Branch of Friends, the Hicksites, whose yearly meeting occurs in May. This appeal, we regret to say, did not bear any visible fruit. No official answer whatever was returned, but your Corresponding Secretary heard accidentally that there was so much business claiming the attention of the meeting, the subject was not even brought up.

Somewhat discouraged, but not enough so to prevent her making another attempt, your Corresponding Secretary resolved to try the yearly meeting at Newport, which occurs in June. She sent the same appeal to the Clerk of both the men's and women's meetings. No answer was returned from the men, but not long after, she received a letter from the Clerk of the women's meeting, saying that, although no official action was taken upon the appeal, there were a number who signified their sympathy with the movement, and the Clerk expressed herself as approving strongly of our course, and begged the blessing of God upon our efforts.

The publication in the *Forum*, of last March, of the article written by your Corresponding Secretary in answer to Dr. Keen's claim, made in *Harper's Magazine*, that surgery had been greatly advanced of late years by experiments upon animals, elicited a number of editorials in journals all over the United States, some favorable and some adverse to the

Anti-vivisection movement. Among the latter, one appeared in the *Chicago Herald*, on April 27th, of a very hostile nature, and stating that among other benefits we had derived from experiments upon living animals, was that of Galvanism. Your Corresponding Secretary deemed it best to answer this article, as it appeared in a paper of so much importance, and as it contained so many erroneous statements, taking the opportunity to mention in her reply that the discovery of Galvanism was due to what Galvani had remarked in *dead* frogs, and had nothing to do with living ones, as is stated in an inscription over the balcony of the house where he lived in Bologna. This inscription says that by means of "mortæ Rane," dead frogs, Galvani made his great discovery. Your Corresponding Secretary was so fortunate as to have this answer published in the *Chicago Herald*.

Since then she has written a number of letters to different journals, generally in reply to articles defending Vivisection, some of which have been published and others have been refused publication. One of these appeared in the *New York Tribune* early in July, and another in the *Boston Daily Advertiser* in the beginning of August. During the autumn, another was published in the *New York Tribune*, which had been sent to the *Herald*, but which that paper declined to insert in its columns.

These public letters were the means of entailing upon your Corresponding Secretary a great amount of private correspondence; as she received letters from those who sympathized with her views and those who did not, among the latter being two vivisectors, who seemed desirous of entering into an argument upon the subject. Your Corresponding Secretary desires to acknowledge the valuable aid that she has received in this great labor of answering all the articles that have appeared in the public journals in defence of Vivisection, from our well-known colleagues, Mrs. Mary F. Lovell, Mr. Philip J. Peabody, and Mr. Elliott W. Preston.

The *New York World*, of Sunday, January 11th, contained

an article, three columns in length, written in the interest of Vivisection and the Vivisectors, by Henry Guy Carleton, and filled with erroneous statements. It aroused a great deal of attention, and a request was made to your Corresponding Secretary to answer it. She did so, and sent the answer to the Editor of the *World*, who refused to publish it, and returned it to her with a letter, saying that he did not wish any controversy upon the subject in his journal, and that he only inserted the article by Carleton because it was *in favor* of Vivisection. Since then it has been stated that Mr. Peabody was going to make an effort to have an answer to Carleton published in the *World*, but we greatly fear that he has not succeeded.

In spite of these discouragements we realize that there has been an immense change for the better during the past year. At this time, a year ago, scarcely a newspaper in any part of the country would publish anything against Vivisection; now the *New York Tribune* and *Times* have both come out strongly in protest against the horribly cruel experiments that have been performed during the last few months, and various other journals have shown a great willingness to give a place in their columns, to anything that we send them upon the subject.

Some letters have been received by your Cor. Secretary desiring publications, by young men who were competing for the prize offered by Mr. Angell, and one from a young man in Saginaw, Michigan, desiring some arguments against Vivisection, to assist him in a debate. These requests have all been attended to, and the result seems to have been promising, as Mr. Angell writes that the essays submitted to him on the anti-Vivisection side are mostly excellent.

One singular fact that we have noticed in connection with the various editorials or communications defending Vivisection that have appeared in the various journals, is, the great ignorance of the writers, of the subject which they are treating, and the wonderfully mendacious statements which, owing

to this ignorance, they are constantly making. For example, a writer in the *Toledo Bee*, of April 9th, says, "it is well known that there is a statute in England which prohibits vivisections." Another, in the "*Indianapolis News*," says, when speaking of the United States, "The laws prohibit vivisection upon an animal while in a conscious state." These are but an infinitesimal portion of the misstatements with which we are confronted nearly every day of our lives, but they will serve as an instance of the bad weapons which are used by our adversaries to bolster up a bad cause.

Respectfully submitted by

CAROLINE EARLE WHITE,

Cor. Secretary of Amer. A. V. Soc.

FOR 1891.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

LIFE MEMBERSHIP, \$50.00.

LIFE MEMBERS.

*Mrs. J. Rhea Barton.
Mrs. Clarence H. Clark.
Mr. Charles Motley Clark.
Miss Mary D. Fox.
Miss Hinds.

*Hon. Wm. A. Porter.
Mr. R. W. Ryerss.
*Mrs. Joseph W. Ryerss.
Mrs. W. G. Thomas.
Miss Anne Waln.

Mr. and Mrs. Joel J. Baily..\$ 4 00	Mr. Henry Flanders.....\$ 2 00
Mrs. Thos. W. Baily 2 00	Mrs. George W. Freeman... 5 00
Miss S. L. Baldwin 2 00	Miss Anna Griffith 2 00
Mrs. Richard Biddle 2 00	Prof. and Mrs. J. Rendel
Mrs. Charles J. Biddle 2 00	Harris 5 00
Mr. Charles Biddle..... 2 00	Mrs. Wm. Helme..... 5 00
Miss Adele Biddle 2 00	Miss Hernerson..... 1 00
Mrs. M. L. Bisbing 2 00	Miss Emily Hinds..... 50 00
Miss A. C. Bisbing..... 2 00	Mrs. Lydia A. Irons, Ohio.. 3 00
Mr. George Blight 2 00	Mrs. Marion C. Jordan..... 50
Miss Boggs..... 2 00	The Misses Kendall, N. Y... 10 00
Mrs. Bowie..... 5 00	Mrs. F. J. Kimball..... 2 00
Mrs. W. H. Bradley, Milwaukee 2 00	Miss Annie C. Knight..... 50 00
Mrs. Conyers Button..... 2 00	Miss Ellen Lisle 2 00
Mrs. Mary W. W. Brown .., 4 00	Mrs. Edmund Lewis..... 2 00
Mrs. Charles Clingan..... 2 00	Mrs. A. Sydney Logan 5 00
Mr. B. B. Comegys 2 00	Mr. A. Sydney Logan..... 2 00
Mr. and Mrs. Philip S. P.	Mrs. A. L. Lowry..... 25 00
Conner 4 00	Mrs. Wayne MacVeagh..... 2 00
Miss Croxall..... 5 00	Mrs. James Martin..... 5 00
Miss S. K. Davidson 15 00	Mr. James Martin..... 2 00
Mr. C. L. Doll, Alabama ... 15 50	Mrs. F. T. Mason..... 5 00
Mr. George H. Earle..... 2 00	Miss Milligan..... 2 00
Mrs. John H. Easby 2 00	Miss M. E. Milligan 2 00
Mr. May S. Easby 2 00	Miss E. McEwen..... 5 00
Miss Ewing, Newtown 5 00	Miss M. A. McEwen..... 2 00
Miss Mary D. Fox100 00	Miss Eliza Otto..... 2 00
Mr. Stephen Farrelly..... 5 00	
Mr. Charles Ferguson 10 00	
Miss Frances Ferguson 5 00	

Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Cruger
Pell, N. Y.....\$20 00

Mrs. J. C. Randall..... 5 00
Mrs. John Robbins..... 3 00
Mr. R. W. Ryerss..... 50 00

Mrs. Edward Scull..... 2 00
Mrs. Robert W. Smith..... 5 00
Miss Grace A. Smith..... 2 00
Mrs. James C. Smith..... 5 00
Mrs. A. May Stevenson..... 2 00
Miss Anna P. Stevenson..... 2 00
Miss E. W. Stevenson..... 2 00
Mrs. Henry C. Stimson..... 2 00
Mrs. Dexter S. Stone..... 3 00
Mrs. Eleanor Stroud..... 2 00
Miss Stroud 2 00

Mr. and Mrs. S. Hinds
Thomas.....\$10 00
Miss Emily Hinds Thomas.. 10 00
Mrs. C. R. Thomas..... 2 00
Miss C. W. Thorn..... 3 00
Miss Emily Tilghman..... 2 00
Miss Rosa M. Towne..... 5 00

Mrs. L. D. Vail..... 2 00
Mrs. John K. Valentine 2 00

Mrs. John G. Watmough... 5 00
Mrs. Samuel Welsh .. 2 00
Miss Fannie Welsh..... 2 00
Mrs. R. P. White 5 00
Mr. Thomas Earle White... 2 00
Miss Ella C. White..... 2 00
Miss Rebecca White..... 25 00
Mrs. Owen J. Wister..... 5 00
Mr. Jacob Williams..... 5 00

HONORARY MEMBERS.

ARCHBISHOP RYAN, D.D.

REV. CHARLES ROADS,
Nineteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church.

REV. JOHN D. BECKLEY, D.D.,
Beth Eden Baptist Church.

REV. W. W. BARR, D.D.,
(1425 Chestnut Street) Eighth United Presbyterian
Church.

REV. J. GRAY BOLTON,
Hope Presbyterian Church.

REV. GEO. VAN DEURS,
Harper Memorial Church.

REV. JAMES LISK, D.D.,
Centennial Baptist Church.

REV. J. S. SIBOLE,
St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

REV. FRANCIS EDWARD SMILEY.

REV. JAMES H. MARR,
Beacon Presbyterian Church.

REV. ENOCH STUBBS,
Thirteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church.

RT. REV. O. D. WHITAKER.

REV. SAMUEL E. APPLETON, D.D.,
Church of the Mediator.

REV. I. L. NICHOLSON, D.D.,
St. Mark's Church.

REV. WILLIAM N. MCVICKAR, D.D.,
Church of the Holy Trinity.

REV. FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, D.D.,
Beacon Presbyterian Church.

REV. W. P. WHITE,
Mt. Airy Presbyterian Church.

REV. J. KIRKPATRICK,
Westminster Presbyterian Church.

REV. L. Y. GRAHAM, D.D.,
Olivet Presbyterian Church.

REV. J. C. THOMPSON, D.D.,
Scot's Presbyterian Church.

REV. W. H. LINDERMUTH,
St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church.

REV. ALFRED J. P. MCCLURE,
Church of the Holy Trinity.

REV. IRWIN P. MCCURDY, D.D.,
Southwestern Presbyterian Church.

REV. JEROME LINDERMUTH.

ANNUAL REPORT OF TREASURER.

Dr.	Cr.
Balance on hand, January 24th, 1890.....\$ 822 31	
Received for dues.....\$289 00	
" donations..... 295 00	
Interest on deposits..... 31 91	
<u>615 91</u>	
\$1438 22	
	Paid for postage, envelopes and wrappers..\$105 93
	Printing..... 227 25
	Lectures..... 184 00
	Rent of office and clerk hire..... 332 37
	Miscellaneous 43 20
	<u>892 75</u>
	\$545 47
	Balance on hand, January 30th, 1891.....

Audited and found correct, March 12th, 1891.

SAMUEL HINDS THOMAS,
CAROLINE A. BOGGS.

LETTERS FROM CLERGYMEN OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

November 17th, 1890.

MRS. MARY F. LOVELL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Dear Madam:—I am in receipt of your esteemed letter on "Vivisection;" also two pamphlets entitled respectively, "Vivisection in America," (1) how taught, (2) how practiced, and "Light in Dark Places."

I cannot say that I have carefully read the pamphlets; I could *not do* this; for, to one of my nature, the details of cruel torture inflicted upon God's unfortunate dumb creatures, unable to express their suffering, save by agonizing cries, or to avoid man's inhumanity by strategic device, are too revolting to contemplate. It is hard to conceive of such atrocities perpetrated in this 19th century of so-called progress and civilization, to say nothing of the humanizing efforts supposed to have been accomplished by Christianity. Such atrocities have their counterpart only in the jungles of Africa, or the barbarous tortures inflicted by the Indian upon his captive enemy in this age. To find it among any white race, we must turn the wheel of civilization and progress back to the dark ages when a Polycarp was burnt, or an Ignatius torn to pieces by lions, or when a Nero feasted and raced while dogs tore to pieces helpless Christians sewed up in sacks, or when uttering their death shrieks on the cross.

It really seems to me that no interests of science can justify such atrocities. A heathen boy was put to death for plucking out the eyes of a squirrel. Shall we "out Herod-Herod?" The man who can engage in such cruelties has, in my mind, sunk so low that the plummet of brutality cannot sound the depths of his depravity. All humanity should protest in its own name and in the name of that God to whom these creatures belong.

I shall use the utmost of my poor ability to bring this matter before the public and to aid you in its suppression.

With all my heart bidding you God-speed in your noble work I am, etc.

CALIFORNIA, November 25th, 1890.

Dear Madam:—I am in willing sympathy with you in the cause you are so nobly urging. There must be self-sacrifice on your part, which, apart from its direction, exacts my great respect and consideration. I am hardly a believer in that excuse or argument for vivisection, which has the weight of an axiom with so many people, viz., that it is for the good of man. I very much question if the torture of the innocent is for the good of man; or if the good of man is the predominant consideration in all matters. I will gladly read the pamphlets you inform me you will send, although I scarcely feel the need of being more deeply stirred against what I hold a horrid and debasing vice.

CALIFORNIA, November 26th, 1890.

MRS. MARY F. LOVELL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

My Dear Madam :—I hasten to acknowledge the receipt of your interesting communication of the 20th inst., and to assure you of my hearty co-operation in the *noble Christian* work you have undertaken. Upon the subject of cruelty to animals—Vivisection, or any other form of brutality towards God's dumb creatures—you touch in my heart a place most keenly responsive, and I would that the country throughout might ring with the words of denunciation which arise within me when I think of it. The "dear dumb animals" are endeared to me by a thousand ties, and thankfully do I acknowledge and point out to others the God-given instinct which causes them to approach me fearlessly, as though knowing me to be their loving friend. I not only assure you of having preached on the divine quality of *mercy*—of mercy demanded at our hands to the lowest of God's creatures, if anything can be thus called of his creation—but I will comply with your request to do so again. I pray you to keep me informed as to the good work you have undertaken.

Wishing you all success and praying that our Heavenly Father may abundantly bless and prosper you, I am faithfully your brother in the Lord Christ.

COLORADO, November 25th, 1890.

Dear Madam :—Yours of Nov. 20th, received. I fully agree with you in condemning this terrible evil, and I never lose an opportunity to denounce it. You may be sure that I will do all in my power to mould public sentiment to that end.

INDIANA, December 1st, 1890.

My Dear Madam :—Your appeal and pamphlets on the subject of Vivisection have been received. I do most heartily sympathize with the Anti-Vivisection movement, and will gladly do all in my power to advance it. I wish that every so-called scientist or physician who practices Vivisection could be subjected to like treatment himself. It would be only a just penalty for such a hideous crime.

MARYLAND, November 3d, 1890.

Madam :—I have received and read with attention the communication which you were good enough to send me. It discusses what has long been a theme of the most heartfelt denunciation with me—the hellish practice of vivisection. I earnestly hope that you may meet with abundant success in your efforts to stir up public opinion against this crime. . . .

That you can ever melt the stony heart of a vivisector, I do not believe. He has parted with every feeling of tenderness. But a public opinion which may prohibit these wretches, under ruinous penalties, from their detestable work, you may succeed in inspiring.

That you may be able to do so, is my heartfelt wish.

MASSACHUSETTS, October 31st, 1890.

MRS. MARY F. LOVELL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

My Dear Madam :—I thank you for the pamphlets you are so good as to send me. I shall read them with much interest, and do all I can to help the cause in whose behalf they plead.

MISSOURI, November 19th, 1890.

Dear Madam :—I duly received, and read with feelings of deepest pain, your letter, with pamphlets enclosed, also the other papers this day arrived. God grant the day may soon come when this awful sin of "Vivisection" shall be by law swept from the face of the earth. It is in my opinion utterly accursed and wholly abominable. I never would tolerate either friend or acquaintance who defended such iniquity—and that any *woman* could ever do so, surpasses my belief. I shall never cease to speak against this most horrible practice and hideous disgrace of Christian lands.

MISSOURI, December 3d, 1890.

Dear Madam :—Some days since I received and read with interest, the leaflets you sent me on "Concerning Vivisection," and "An Appeal to Christians," but I waited for the other pamphlets you proposed to send before replying to your circular-letter as requested. The pamphlets came to-day; but the horrible details and illustrations repel me from reading—I had almost said! As a child and a youth I was, I presume, quite indifferent to the sufferings of the animal creation; but in my late years I am glad to find myself exceedingly sensitive to such sufferings, for was it not the fault of man that the animal creation "groaneth" in pain to this day? I am heart and soul in favor of any movement that will curb the torturing tendencies of the beast—man!

NEW JERSEY, November 28th, 1890.

My Dear Madam :—The pamphlets you sent to me I have read with horror. They have been a revelation to me of a phase of human nature of which I was wholly ignorant, and am sorry enough not to be ignorant still. As to the subject treated of, it appears to me that any one professing to be a man, could have but one opinion—utter condemnation.

OHIO, December 11th, 1890.

My Dear Madam :—I thank you for the letter and pamphlets on "Vivisection." I have read them with horror and indignation. I am glad an effort is being made to stop this cruelty. I will do what I can to help on the good cause.

PENNSYLVANIA, November 14th, 1890.

MRS. MARY F. LOVELL, Bryn Mawr.

Dear Madam :—I thank you for the articles on Vivisection. All that I can do in my limited sphere, shall be done. The horrible torture which I have heard and read about, *cut me to the heart*.

PENNSYLVANIA, November 21st, 1890.

Dear Madam :—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of Nov. 1st (received only a few days ago), and also, through this morning's mail, of the two pamphlets, "Vivisection in America" and "Light in Dark Places." The damnable cruelties perpetrated in the name of science which they detail, are simply sickening, and call for immediate repressive action. . . .

PENNSYLVANIA, November 25th, 1890.

Dear Madam :—Absence from home for more than two weeks, and the natural accumulation of correspondence and of matters to be attended to after such an absence, will prevent me now from more than a grateful acknowledgment of the favor shown by including me in the list of correspondents to whom you have kindly sent your circular-letter and pamphlets on vivisection. I have perhaps through you already received some vigorous protests, and have felt horrified at the cruelties practiced on dumb animals. I have not, however, given such attention to their just claim on humanity for protection and rescue as I ought; simply because I have not imagined that my voice would reach any who practice vivisection. I have only glanced at the publications just received from you, and am only acknowledging your favor; but I will take time to look more carefully at the revolting details, that I may be able, when occasion offers, to bear my testimony against the practice. I sincerely wish you God speed in your righteous endeavors to awake public interest and to secure proper legislation on this subject.

NEW YORK, November 3d, 1890.

MRS. LOVELL.

Your pamphlets on Vivisection came last evening. From all I have been able to learn from them I cheerfully add that you have my profound sympathy in the Christian stand you have taken against brutality under the specious plea of "Science."

I should be happy to extend your views to the best of my ability, and wish you all success.

RHODE ISLAND, December 18th, 1890.

MRS. MARY F. LOVELL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Dear Madam:—I have received your circular letter and, later, pamphlets. I wish to convey to you my hearty sympathy in the good work you have undertaken. I have long wondered that those who are so deeply concerned about lesser wrongs have not seen the necessity of a crusade against this greatest of all crimes. Greatest, because perpetrated against the inoffending and defenceless servants and companions of man. I think that the time will come when a preacher will not be regarded as going out of his line of sacred remark when he condemns this practice in the severest terms, and possibly when cruelty to animals will meet with the same condemnation as cruelty to children. The plea of science is the hardest thing to deal with now, and it is this that has doubtless kept many from speaking out as they ought, especially when physicians are an influential part of congregations. . . . I am obliged to you for letting me know that the battle is begun, and every humane soul will bless you for taking the initiative in this country.

SOUTH CAROLINA, December 2d, 1890.

Dear Madam:—I am heartily in sympathy with the efforts that are being made to put a stop to the *diabolical* work of Vivisection. A scandal and reproach to humanity and an outrage to every precept of Christianity. The judgment of a merciful God must sooner or later, but surely, be visited upon the cruel men who, under the *pretence* of science and of benefitting their fellow man, thus hideously torture their *fellow* and dependent dumb creatures.

I am more than ready to assist, in every way possible, the good work that has been begun. May God help us.

VERMONT, December 17th, 1890.

Dear Madam:—Your letter and pamphlet on Vivisection both received. I must be excused from reading what I am sure must be horrible and revolting. I am a great lover of animals, and deprecate the cruel, heartless, and I believe unnecessary barbarism practiced on the patient, trusting, helpless dumb animals in the name of science. In the constitution of my Guilds for boys, I have always had a section in reference to the injuring of *any living creature*.

I sincerely trust your efforts may be crowned with a gratifying measure of success.

WISCONSIN, November 13th, 1890.

Dear Madam:—Your letter and circulars of the 10th inst. have been gratefully received, and I am quite in sympathy with any movement that tends toward the abolition of vivisection. I am shocked at the so-called *progress* of the age. The constant attempt of Babel to scale heaven deserves rebuke. A reckless curiosity to pry open the secret-vaults of nature is loathsome, and can only end in confusion. . . .

WM. F. FELL & CO. PRINTERS, 1220-24 Sansom St., Philadelphia.